

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: ZOOM VIDEO
COMMUNICATIONS INC. PRIVACY
LITIGATION

Case No. [20-cv-02155-LHK](#) (SVK)

**ORDER REGARDING JOINT
DISCOVERY STATEMENT DATED
MARCH 29, 2021**

Re: Dkt. No. 170

The Court has considered the Parties' Joint Statement Regarding Discovery Dispute ("Statement") filed on March 29, 2021. Dkt. 170. The Statement presents two overarching issues: 1) whether discovery should be stayed or in some way restricted pending a second amended complaint and a challenge to that pleading; and 2) whether Zoom should provide hit counts as to all proposed search terms as part of the Parties' meet and confer efforts regarding production of ESI.

The Parties' Statement was followed by Zoom filing a Motion to Stay Discovery before Judge Koh. Dkt. 172. Judge Koh has ruled on Zoom's motion, denying a stay of discovery. Dkt. 174. Accordingly, discovery is not stayed in this case, and Zoom is **ORDERED** to immediately resume its rolling document production without limitation.

Regarding hit counts, both Parties report on robust meet and confer efforts, yet the Parties' respective issues are not crystalized beyond Plaintiffs wanting hit counts on all of its terms and Zoom unwilling to provide the information. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows: Plaintiffs are to prioritize 50 of the 117 proposed terms for which Zoom will promptly provide unique hit counts; from that point the Parties are to quickly meet and confer further regarding the remaining 67 terms. If the Parties are unable to work out a compromise as to the provision of hit

counts for remaining terms, the Parties may submit a further joint discovery statement. The statement must provide a table that: organizes the disputed terms into categories; sets forth each disputed term; provides a short, single sentence in support of the term; and a short, single sentence in opposition to the term.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 7, 2021



SUSAN VAN KEULEN
United States Magistrate Judge